

REMARKS

Claims 21-24 and 28-29 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Rose. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The instant invention relates to a network node or exchange, and the ability to add exchanges in the network, such that the exchanges have the same signaling point code as other exchanges in the network. More specifically, with reference for example to Fig. 1, a first network node B_{Vst} has two internal nodes N1, N2. A signaling connection S1 is set up from the second internal logical network N2 to another network A_{Vst} in the telecommunications network. Signaling of the network node A_{Vst} occurs via signaling connection S1, whereby both network nodes B_{Vst} and A_{Vst} have the same signaling point code.

Rose discloses an exchange for a communication network in which a plurality of nodes for processing calls from or to a first neighboring exchange, in which two or more of the nodes are arranged to be connected to the first neighboring exchange by separate trunk routes, and a signaling point code being assigned to the node-end of each trunk route, where the signaling point codes assigned to the node-ends of the separate trunk routes to the first neighboring exchange differ from each other (see abstract). In the claimed invention, on the other hand, the network nodes have the same signaling point code. Hence, while the various nodes in Rose utilize different signaling point codes (X, Y), as noted by the Examiner, no two nodes utilize the same signaling point code when communicating with an exchange. Rose therefore fails to disclose the claimed limitation of a signaling connection is set up from the second internal logical network to another network node of the telecommunication network, via which signaling connection all signaling of the another network node is done, wherein both network nodes have the same signaling point code, as required by the claimed invention (see, for example claim 1).

Claims 25-27, 30-34, and 38-40 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over various combinations of Rose, Okanou, Havansi, Segal, Doshi and Gavaras. The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the same reasons presented in the arguments above, and since neither Okanou, Havansi, Segal, Doshi nor Gavaras disclose the claimed features.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to

charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing, referencing Attorney
Docket No. 119010-014.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak
Reg. No. 43,148
Customer No. 29177

Dated: November 21, 2007